

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated May 30, 2007. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-4 and 6-25 are under consideration in this application. Claims 7 and 25 are being amended, as set forth above and in the attached marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim Applicants' invention. All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification, especially page 13, lines 5-13. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Allowed Subject Matter

The allowability of claims 4, 6-8, and 19-21 was withdrawn in view of the newly cited reference. However, claims 9, 11-12, 15, 17-18 and 22 would still be allowed if rewritten into independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 13-14, 16, 19-21 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 6,873,309 to Suzuki (hereinafter "Suzuki"). This rejection has been carefully considered, but is most respectfully traversed.

First, as recited in claims 1 & 4, the number of the non-selected state scanning lines at the low impedance state is $n_1 \times 2$ or more ($N(NS, LZ) \geq n_1 \times 2$, p. 17, lines 3-8), while the number of the scanning lines in the selected state is n_1 . Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (p. 3, last 2 lines of the outstanding Office Action), Suzuki (col. 22, lines 33-37) does not teach or suggest such a feature as shown in the following comparison Table.

Term	Definition	claims 1 & 4	Suzuki
N (SEL)	the number of scanning lines in the selected state	n1	1
N(NS, LZ)	the number of scanning lines in the non-selected state at a low impedance state	n1x2 or more	1

Based on the description of Suzuki (col. 22, lines 33-37), when cathode (810) R2 is selected, only the (810) R1 is in a non-selected state and at low-impedance state. Since “an adjacent row is set to the ground potential with a low impedance”, $N(NS, LZ)=1$ at the other time points as well. For example, even when $n1=1$, $N(NS, LZ)=1$ in Suzuki, rather ≥ 2 as recited in claims 1 & 4. As such, Suzuki does not satisfy that the number of the non-selected state scanning lines at the low impedance state $N(NS, LZ)$ is $n1 \times 2$ or more.

Secondly, as recited in claims 7 & 13, the non-selected state scanning lines at the low impedance state is at a lower impedance state than the non-selected state scanning lines at the high impedance state ($Z(NS, LZ) < Z(NS, HZ)$; p. 17, lines 7 and 12-15), and the non-selected state at the low impedance state $Z(NS, LZ)$ and the non-selected state at the high impedance state $Z(NS, HZ)$ are repeated alternately (Fig. 1).”

In Fig. 1, “the non-selected state at the low impedance state (NS, LZ)” 751 and “the non-selected state at the high impedance state (NS, HZ)” (shown as the dotted line in the waveform R1 in Fig. 1) are repeated alternately according to the present invention.

The Examiner simply failed to address the underlined feature in the outstanding Office Action. In Fig. 30, Suzuki switches from “the non-selected state and at the high impedance state (NS, HZ)” (shown as the dotted line in the waveform R1 in Fig. 30) to “the non-selected state at the low impedance state (NS, LZ)” (shown as the solid line in the waveform R1 in Fig. 30), and then to the selected state, rather than alternately switching/repeating between (NS, LZ) and (NS, HZ) as recited in claims 7 & 13.

Thirdly, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion (p. 4, 7th paragraph of the outstanding Office Action), col. 22, lines 19-37 in Suzuki simply does not teach or suggest that “the scanning electrodes in contact with the spacer are set to the low impedance state during the display operation period” as recited in claim 21.

Applicants respectfully contend that none of the cited references or their combinations teaches or suggests the features recited in the independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 13 as the present invention. As such, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the rejections raised in the Office Action. The withdrawal of the outstanding prior art rejections is in order, and is respectfully solicited.


Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

August 30, 2007

SPF/JCM/JT